

REMARKS

The Office Communication mailed January 24, 2008 stated that the Amendment filed on October 31, 2007 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because (1) the Amendment did not provide appropriate corrected drawings sheets or (2) Applicants did not submit a Petition regarding an outstanding objection to the drawings. Applicants hereby submit a Supplemental Amendment to the October 31 Amendment addressing the Office's concerns in the January 24 Office Communication. Please amend the application and reconsider the application in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-11, 14-24, and 27-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the drawings have been amended to add new Figs. 14-23, and the specification has been amended in regard to the new figures. The as-filed application supports the amendments to the drawings and specification by at least the as-filed original claims 7-8. No new matter has been added.

The Office has objected to the drawings because the drawings purportedly do not show all of the features recited in claims 7 and 8. The April 16, 2007 Office Action at page 5 also states that "a vascular prosthesis having two ends of generally similar geometries ... is not conveyed to the ordinary practitioner by the drawings." As stated previously in the record, Applicants respectfully reassert that the Office's objection is not consistent with applicable law and rules, and that a person of ordinary skill would be able to understand the claimed invention from the as-filed drawings.

Applicants also bring to the Office's attention that the drawings were not objected to with regard to claims 7 and 8 from the parent application, now U.S. Patent No. 6,589,278, and that an objection in the instant application is inconsistent with the Office's position with regard to the parent application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the amendments herein to the drawings and specification be considered proposed and entered only if the Office maintains its objection. If the Office agrees to withdraw the objection, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the drawings and specification provided in this Amendment not be entered or that they be entered and subsequently deleted from the application by an Examiner's Amendment.

With regard to the remaining outstanding rejections, Applicants refer the Office to the Remarks provided in the October 31 Amendment.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Application and the prompt allowance of at least the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3840. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Allis
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 50,532

Date: February 13, 2008
Patent Administrator
Proskauer Rose LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202.416.6800
Facsimile: 202.416.6899
CUSTOMER NO: 61263

Customer No. 61263